

# **EXHIBIT G**



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
12/713,220	02/26/2010	Andrew WOLFE	121-0019-US-REG	4243

  

83446	7590	12/03/2012
REN-SHENG INTERNATIONAL IP MANAGEMENT LTD.		
GENE I. SU		
7F, NO. 57, SEC. 2, DUN HUA S. ROAD		
TAIPEI, 106		
TAIWAN		

  

EXAMINER	
BUTLER, DENNIS	

  

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2115	

  

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/03/2012	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gsu@suipconsulting.com  
 filing@suipconsulting.com  
 gene.i.su@gmail.com

<b><i>Applicant-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> 12/713,220	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WOLFE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DENNIS M. BUTLER	<b>Art Unit</b> 2115	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dennis Butler (examiner 2115). (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Gene Su (applicant's representative). (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 27 November 2012.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Issues Discussed ☐ 101 ☒ 112 ☒ 102 ☒ 103 ☐ Others  
(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 10-13, 15 and 18.

Identification of prior art discussed: Jacobowitz (2009/0106576), Kim (2009/0138737) and von Kaene! (2010/0188115).

**Substance of Interview**  
(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

Claims 15 and 18 were discussed regarding the 112, second paragraph rejection. Applicant's representative agreed to amend the claims to clarify that communication is between the first and second sets of processor cores. Claims 1, 10-13, 15 and 18 were discussed regarding the art rejections under 35 USC 102 and 103. Applicant's representative referred to figure 3 of the specification and stated that clock signals 1 through 3 were different/independent clock signals input to the PLLs while Jacobowitz disclosed using a single reference clock. The examiner agreed that Jacobowitz discloses using a single reference clock and that clock signals 1 through 3 of figure 3 are different than disclosed by Jacobowitz. However, the broadest reasonable interpretation of the recited claim language (i.e., claim 1: first set of processor cores configured to dynamically receive a first clock signal) reads on the clock output of the local oscillators of Jacobowitz and also reads on the output of the PLLs shown in applicant's figure 3. Applicant's representative stated that he would discuss amends to the claims with applicant regarding clock signals 1 through 3 of figure 3.

**Applicant recordation instructions:** The formal written reply to the last Office action must include the substance of the interview. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, applicant is given a non-extendable period of the longer of one month or thirty days from this interview date, or the mailing date of this interview summary form, whichever is later, to file a statement of the substance of the interview

**Examiner recordation instructions:** Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment

/DENNIS M BUTLER/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2115	
--	--